

09/745,594

**Remarks**

Reconsideration of the above referenced application in view of the enclosed amendment and remarks is requested. Claims 1, 5, 7, 10 and 15 are amended. Claims 6 and 11 are canceled. Their limitations are added to Claims 5 and 10, respectively. Claims 1-5, 7-10, and 12-20 are now pending in the application.

**ARGUMENT**

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,694,335 to Hopmann et al. (hereinafter "Hopmann et al.") in view of U.S. Patent 6,173,322 to Hu (hereinafter "Hu"). This rejection is respectfully traversed and Claims 1-20 are believed allowable based on the following discussion.

Applicants' cache device may store information from the user (portable device) until such time as the remote device becomes available. For instance, a user may update large amounts of information to be synchronized with a database on a remote device, but the remote device may not always be available. Further, the user may desire to uncouple the portable wireless communication appliance from the cache device, i.e., take the portable device to another location, and enable the remote database to be updated as soon as the remote device becomes available.

Hopmann et al. teach a device for synchronizing changes among multiple copies of data. Hopmann et al. teach that an identifier represents the current state of the data and the identifier is used to determine what, if any, changes have occurred to the data. Thus, instead of comparing the data itself to see if changes have been made, the identifier is used to simply and easily determine if changes were made to the data.

Hu teaches the distribution of client requests received from a digital computer network to provide an intermediary between the client and one or more content servers that actually service the client request. Hu uses a data cache according to "conventional caching techniques" (Col. 5, line 59) to enable the client requests to be serviced more efficiently. The content provider is not accessed if the data is already in the data cache.

09/745,594

With regard to Claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Hopmann et al. teach a communication system for accessing and managing a database, comprising a portable wireless communication appliance and a remote device with access to the database. The Examiner admits that Hopmann et al. does not teach a cache device configured to communicate wirelessly with the portable wireless communication appliance and to communicate with the remote device, the cache device storing a copy of a predetermined portion of the database, but asserts that Hu does teach this.

Hopmann et al. teach the synchronization of data on a network. Hopmann et al. do not teach the management of a database, although the synchronization method is asserted to be suitable for use with a database (Col. 5, lines 3-5). If the teachings of Hopmann et al. were applied to databases, it is not taught or suggested that only a predetermined portion of the database is to be stored in a cache. Similarly, Hu does not teach storing a copy of a predetermined portion of the database. Hu teaches caching heavily accessed data, according to traditional cache techniques. (Col. 5, line 59) Traditional techniques do not cache predetermined portions of databases, but merely data that is frequently accessed.

Applying the teachings of Hu to Hopmann et al. would result in a system that synchronized data on a network where frequently accessed data from content servers may be accessed via a data cache. A combination of these references would not result in a wireless device used to access a database in a connected mode or unconnected mode based on the accessibility of the remote device. Moreover, combination of these two references is improper as they solve different and unrelated problems. Thus, there is no motivation to add a cache to the synchronization of data on a network. The synchronization, as taught by Hopmann et al. solves the problem when many clients and servers on a network use the same data. Hu's device is meant to efficiently distribute client requests to multiple content servers and cache commonly accessed information. Addition of a cache to the device of Hopmann et al. would make synchronization more complex, as another component would need to be synchronized in addition to the client and server data. Further, application of Hu's cache to Hopmann et al. synchronization would not result in a portable wireless device which accesses a database from one of the remote device or the cache device when the remote device is unavailable. Similarly, Claims 2 and 3 are believed allowable, as discussed above.

09/745,594

As per Claim 4, the Examiner asserts that Hopmann et al. teach a storage device for storing the copy of a predetermined portion of the database. Hopmann et al. teach a storage device, but not as recited in Applicant's claims. Hopmann et al. teach that multiple servers contain the same data set (Col. 11, lines 15-17), but do not teach that a predetermined portion of a database is to be managed and copied to the cache for use by a portable wireless device.

With regard to Claim 15, the Examiner asserts that Hopmann et al. teach a method for setting cache device preferences (citing, Col. 11, lines 15-30, lines 34-52 and Col. 12, lines 35-45). Since caches are not taught or suggested by Hopmann et al., this assertion is erroneous. Further, Hopmann et al. teach that a local copy of data is present on the client and the server and that the server and client are to be synchronized. Applicant's invention requires that a predetermined portion of the database is copied to the cache, and not the client (e.g., portable wireless device). An advantage of Applicant's invention is that the portable device need not have storage sufficient to hold the database portion, because the copy is stored in the cache device, instead. Thus, the synchronization as taught by Hopmann et al. is not applicable to Applicant's claimed invention.

As per Claims 5, 10 and 16, there is no motivation to add a cache to the synchronization method as taught by Hopmann et al. Further, neither Hopmann et al, nor Hu teach or suggest that a predetermined portion of a database is stored on a cache communicatively coupled with a portable wireless communication appliance.

As per Claims 7 and 12, Hopmann et al. does not teach setting cache-device preferences, as asserted by the Examiner. The Examiner admits that Hopmann et al. does not teach or suggest using a cache. Thus, no cache preferences are taught or suggested. Moreover, specifically as recited in Claim 7, cache-device preferences are explicitly defined as user preferences and configuration settings. This type of preference is neither taught nor suggested by the cited references.

Claims 8, 9, 13 and 14 are believed allowable for reasons discussed above.

With regard to Claim 17, the Examiner asserts that Hu teaches that the cache device has a storage capacity larger than the portable wireless communication appliance, but fails to clearly cite where Hu teaches this limitation. Thus, this rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

09/745,594

As per Claim 18, the Examiner asserts that Hu teaches wherein the cache device is configured to receive the copy of a predetermined portion of the database from the portable wireless communication appliance for storing when the remote device is unavailable. However, Hu does not teach caching a predetermined portion of a database. Hu teaches caching frequently used data according to traditional caching methods.

Similarly, Claim 19 is rejected under the same misconception. The Examiner asserts that Hu teaches that the cache device is configured to send the copy of a predetermined portion of the database to the remote device, for storing, when the remote device becomes available. In fact, the cited reference (Col. 5, lines 57-60) specifically states that data is stored according to conventional caching techniques. Conventional caching techniques do not copy predetermined portions of a database to the cache, but merely cache frequently used data.

With regard to Claim 20, the Examiner asserts that Hu teaches a system wherein the cache device is configured to communicate with the remote device to update the database with the copy of a predetermined portion of the database, when the portable wireless communication appliance is no longer in communication with the cache device. Hu does not teach or suggest that a predetermined portion of a database is to be updated by the portion held in the cache when a portable wireless communication appliance is no longer communicating with the cache device. Applicant's claimed invention enables the database on the remote device to be updated once the portable device has ceased accessing the cache device. This is not how traditional caches devices operate, and as taught by Hu. Hu teaches that a client accesses a cache for information normally to be retrieved from a content server, when the client is in communication with the content server. Hu teaches that the cache either has the frequently accessed data or not, but Hu does not teach that the client may be disconnected from the cache device. Thus, all claims remaining in the application are now allowable.

09/745,594

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Claims 1-5, 7-10, and 12-20 are all in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 633-6845. Early issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Please charge any shortage of fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 02-2666 and please credit any excess fees to such account.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/28/2005

Joni D. Stutman-Horn  
Patent Attorney  
Intel Corporation  
Registration No. 42,173  
(703) 633-6845

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor &  
Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026